

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7-13, 15, 16, and 19-24 remain in the application and claims 1 and 13 have been amended hereby. Claims 2, 5, 6, 14, 17, and 18 have been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12, 13, 14, 16-19, and 22-24 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al.

Features of the data receiving method and apparatus according to the present invention are that a received digital signal includes a program for execution by a computer and that decoded data is supplied to the computer. See Fig. 2, and the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the present application, for example.

An advantage of these features of the present invention is that an operational failure of the computer is prevented when the received digital signal is not properly decoded. See the paragraph bridging pages 21 and 22 of the present application, for example.

Independent claims 1 and 13 have been amended to recite these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. fails to show or suggest that a received digital signal includes a program for execution by a computer and that decoded data is supplied to the computer. Ueno et al. is merely teaching enciphered communication system and

Horikoshi et al. is merely teaching a system for multi-station video communications. Both references are silent about a received digital signal including a program for execution by a computer and decoded data being supplied to the computer.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1 and 13, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 3 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Kim et al.

Claims 3 and 15 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, which rejections over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. have been addressed above and, because there are no features in Kim et al. that somehow could be combined with Ueno et al. and Horikoshi et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 15 are patentably distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Kim et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Trostle.

Claims 8 and 9, and 20 and 21 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively, which rejections over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. have been addressed above and, because there are no features in Trostle that somehow could be combined with Ueno

7217/62910

et al. and Horikoshi et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8, 9, 20, and 21 are patentably distinct over Ueno et al. in view of Horikoshi et al. and Trostle.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP



Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM/PCF:pmc